

Meeting Minutes

CUSC Modifications Panel

Meeting Number 227

Date: 30/11/2018	Location: National Grid House, Warwick
Start: 10:00	End: 13:00

Participants

Attendee	Attend/Regrets	Attendee	Attend/Regrets
Trisha McAuley, Chair (TM)	Attend	James Anderson, User Panel Member (JA)	Attend
Rachel Hinsley, NGESO Code Administrator Representative (RH)	Attend	Paul Jones, User Panel Member (PJ)	Attend
Shazia Akhtar, NGESO Code Administrator, Panel Secretary (SA)	Attend	Michael Jenner, User Panel Alternate (MJ)	Regrets
Louise Schmitz, National Grid Panel Member (LS)	Attend	Kate Dooley, User Panel Alternate (KD)	Dial-In
Simon Lord, User Panel Member (SL)	Dial-In	Cem Suleyman, User Panel Alternate (CS)	Dial-In
Paul Mott, User Panel Member (PM)	Attend	Nadir Hafeez, Authority Representative (NH)	Attend
Laurence Barrett, User Panel Member (LB)	Attend	Andy Pace, Consumers' Panel Member (AP)	Attend
Garth Graham, User Panel Member (GG)	Attend	Damian Clough, ELEXON (DC)	Attend
Robert Longden, User Panel Member (RL)	Attend	Nick Rubin, ELEXON/Proposer CMP280 alternative, Observer (NR)	Attend

Discussions

1. Introductions and Apologies for Absence

- 8338 TM opened the CUSC Modification Panel meeting with introductions and noted that apologies had been received from Michael Jenner. TM introduced Nick Rubin as an observer/Proposer of the CMP280 alternative and Rachel Hinsley as the new Code Administrator representative on the Panel.
- 8339 The Panel thanked Joseph Henry (previous Code Administrator) for all his hard work and contribution to the CUSC Panel.

2. Approval of October CUSC Panel Minutes

- 8340 TM asked the Panel if they had reviewed the comments received from GG, JA and PJ and if there were any points of clarification that needed to be discussed or if further time was needed to review the minutes, as they were sent out relatively late.
- 8341 GG suggested that the Panel be given until the close of play Monday to provide any final comments.
- 8342 The Panel approved the minutes, subject to the incorporation of any final comments provided by 3 December.

3. Review of Actions

Minute 7684

MO to feedback on questions raised during Sandbox presentation and confirm if a modification will be raised.

- 8343 RH stated that John Twomey had provided an update on this at the October Panel, but she could also now confirm that a full modification will be raised for the CUSC along with a light touch modification for Grid Code.
- 8344 RH stated that this action should now be closed and explained that the modifications will be raised within the near future.
- 8345 GG questioned whether they had received clarification on the EU law aspect of this. GG stated that given the CUSC relates to connections and charging they need to get confirmation that a national derogation can legally be issued which derogates from EU law matters before raising a modification. GG explained that charging is covered by the EU Third Package and is supposed to be harmonised and applied cost reflectively, therefore doing something under a national derogation on charging would be going against these principles. GG highlighted that there was also a separate national derogation procedure for connections and they would not be able to use this for derogating EU law requirements regarding connections such as those in the RfG, DCC, HVDC or SOGL Network Codes as there is an European derogation procedures for this.
- 8346 RH confirmed that these issues will be covered off as part of the analysis that they are doing before raising the modifications.
- 8347 The Panel stated that they were happy these issues were being considered as part of that analysis and agreed that this action should be closed.

Minute 7778

Explanatory note to be circulated to industry on the prioritisation stack.

- 8348 RH confirmed that the explanatory note had been circulated to Industry and uploaded onto their website
-

8349 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

Minute 7905

Code Admin to add WG Meeting dates to 'Plan on a Page'

8350 RH explained that they have taken this feedback on board and it will be incorporated within the Plan on a Page when it is revamped as part of the Customer Journey Work that the team are doing. RH stated that as this issue will be addressed in the very near future, she would ask that this action be closed.

8351 LS stated that Code Admin have taken the feedback on board and can be held to account if they fail to deliver.

8352 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

Minute 7949

Code Admin to consider categorising mods based on frequency of Workgroups i.e. once/twice a month or every two months

8353 LS stated that if this has already been recorded as an action by the Code Admin Team is it still worth keeping this action open on the CUSC Panel.

8354 LB stated that the action was for Code Admin to consider if this was an option, it sounds like they are doing that, so he would be happy for the action to be closed.

8355 RL stated that it would be really beneficial if they could receive interim updates on the Customer Journey work that is being done, rather than waiting until the end of the whole process.

8356 TM agreed and stated that it would be useful for both Panels to receive regular updates on this.

8357 RH confirmed that this will be added as a standing item to the agenda going forwards with bi-monthly updates.

8358 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

New Action: Code Admin to add Customer Journey Updates as a standing item to the CUSC/GRID Code Panel agendas

Minute 7956

TM to issue a formal response to MD on the issues raised at their meeting, along with details of Code Admin Improvement plans/Customer Journey.

8359 TM explained that John Twomey (JT) is currently out of the country, but he will be arranging a meeting with TM and RL on his return next week to finalise a response.

8360 The Panel agreed for this action to remain open during the interim period.

Minute 7967

Code Admin to feedback to issues raised by GG on the Interruption Claims Report via email/at the next Panel.

- 8361 SA confirmed that she has circulated an update on the last outstanding claim for 2017 and would ask that this action be closed.
- 8362 GG stated that he had concerns it has taken so long to provide this update when the claim was apparently resolved within 16 working days.
- 8363 SA confirmed that there were issues with SharePoint not being updated to reflect the latest position. SA stated that she will be making sure that they contact the connections team for updates on all live claims before they issue future reports.
- 8364 GG stated that he will wait and see what is on the next quarterly report.
- 8365 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

Minute 8306

Check governance and if quoracy can be achieved by obtaining a number of workgroup nominations from the same company.

- 8366 RH stated that Section 8.20.3 of the CUSC has been distributed to the Panel and it refers to the composition of Workgroup members. RH explained that this states that that the Panel shall ensure, as far as possible, that an appropriate cross-section of representation, experience and expertise is represented on the Workgroup.
- 8367 RH highlighted that this action was raised in relation to CMP300. Drax the Proposer of the modification wanted more than one Drax member on the Workgroup to try and achieve quoracy so that Workgroup meetings could go ahead. RH explained that CMP300 has now achieved quoracy without the need for additional Drax Workgroup members, but this may be something that the Panel wants to consider for future reference.
- 8368 GG stated that he had attended a meeting with Energy UK yesterday and taken away an action to discuss non-CUSC parties having problems getting involved with CUSC Workgroups at today's Panel. GG explained that Elexon use a different approach to source Workgroup members. Anyone can put themselves forward as an expert in a field, once they have registered that expertise they can then be called upon to join Workgroups. GG highlighted that a lot of non-CUSC parties want to join Workgroups but are finding it extremely difficult to do this. GG suggested that may be this is something that the Panel can pick up going forwards to try and increase numbers and representation within Workgroups.
- 8369 LS stated that she had also previously feed this back into the process. LS explained that because Workgroup members are CUSC parties that are representatives of their business. From LS point of view the change process would work more efficiently if members were representatives of their expertise rather than their commercial interests. This may require a modification, but it would lift the requirement for Workgroup members to be a CUSC party.
- 8370 LB stated that is how the CUSC Panel works, the Panel members are elected for their knowledge and expertise and not to represent any commercial interests. May be this something that should also filter down into the Workgroups.
- 8371 TM stated that the feedback she has received also indicates that non-CUSC parties find it difficult to join Workgroups, but recognised that this is something that the Customer Journey work will be picking up going forwards and it may require a modification to be raised.
- 8372 RH confirmed that was correct.
- 8373 AP questioned what currently happened if a non-CUSC party wanted to join the Workgroup.
- 8374 SA confirmed that they would still need another CUSC party to nominate them.
-

-
- 8375 LS stated that this can be difficult to obtain. They may not want to nominate a non-CUSC parties to join the Workgroup in order to protect their own commercial interests.
- 8376 GG questioned when would they see a conclusion to this through the Customer Journey work. GG stated that he felt it was a quick win and was more than happy to raise a narrowly focused modification for the next Panel. This modification would allow the Panel to appoint independent experts to the Workgroup as a halfway house.
- 8377 LS stated that her personal preference is that they do as much work in advance as they can before anyone completes a CUSC proposal form. LS suggested that may be this something that the Customer Journey Team can pick up with GG in the Governance Standing Group.
- 8378 GG stated that he is happy to do this but did not feel a lot of work would be needed to get this modification in quite quickly and it would also address the issues they have been having around quoracy.
- 8379 PJ stated that Section 8.20.5 CUSC states that the CUSC Panel or Workgroup chair can add further members/or vary the members on a Workgroup. It does not state anything about them having to be nominated by a CUSC Party.
- 8380 TM stated that this should be checked and clarified as part of the Customer Journey work.
- 8381 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

New Action: Customer Journey Team to pick up concerns about non-CUSC parties joining Workgroups and changing requirements within the CUSC to mirror Elexon's current arrangements.

New Action: Customer Journey team to confirm if a non-CUSC party does currently need to get a CUSC party nomination to join a Workgroup or if the Panel/Chair can add them to the Workgroup under Section 8.20.5 CUSC.

Minute 8324

Escalate legal text for CMP285 if required

- 8382 RH confirmed that that legal text has been finalised for CMP285 (Original and WACMS). So, this did not need to be escalated.
- 8383 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

Minute 8313

Circulate link to the Retail Energy Code Review

- 8384 RH confirmed that this link was circulated to the Panel on Friday 26 October 2018.
- 8385 The Panel agreed that this action should be closed.

4. Authority Decisions

- 8386 NH confirmed that CMP293 and CMP294 were both progressing well and were on track for them to have a decision by 6 December.
- 8387 NH stated CMP301 had been sent back to the Panel with a letter explaining what additional information was required.
-

- 8388 TM stated that CMP301 will be discussed later during the meeting during conversations on in-flight modifications.
- 8389 TM questioned if CMP302 had now officially been withdrawn.
- 8390 SA stated that they were trying to get hold of the Proposer to discuss Ofgem's recent publication of a Consultation on Small Generator Discount and to confirm if they were happy to withdraw the modification. They will provide a further update on this at the next Panel.

New Action: Code Admin to confirm if CMP302 has been officially withdrawn.

5. **New CUSC Modifications**

- 8391 There were no new modifications raised at the November CUSC Panel.

6. **In-Flight Modifications**

- 8392 RH stated that CMP271/274/276 were all on hold pending the outcome of the TCR/SCR.
- 8393 LB stated that these modifications were put on hold to allow Ofgem to get to this minded to position. Now that they have done this should there be a discussion with the Proposer to confirm next steps, i.e. should the modifications continue, stay on hold or be withdrawn.
- 8394 LS stated that they could ask the Workgroups to reconvene once they have had a chance to review the TCR/SCR publications.
- 8395 LB stated that Code Admin could have an initial chat with the Proposer and arrange a kick off meeting if required.

New Action: Code Admin to contact Proposers of CMP271/274/276 to confirm next steps in light of Ofgem's publication - Minded to position on the TCR/SCR. Code Admin to arrange kick off meetings if required.

CMP280 'Creation of a New Generator TNUoS Demand Tariff which Removes Liability for TNUoS Demand Residual Charges from Generation and Storage Users'. CMP280 aims to remove liability from Generator and Storage Parties for the Demand Residual element of the TNUoS tariff.

And

CMP281 'Removal of BSUoS Charges from Energy Taken From the National Grid System by Storage Facilities'. CMP281 aims to remove liability from storage facilities for Balancing Services Use of System (BSUoS) charges on imports.

- 8396 RH stated that Workgroups had been held on 22 and 29 November and that the Workgroup Reports were due back to the Panel in December 2018. RH requested that the Panel grant a two-month extension to February 2019 to allow both Workgroups sufficient time to finalise their solutions, any alternatives, legal text and carryout a Workgroup vote.
- 8397 SA provided further context on the current developments of both Working groups. SA stated that in relation to CMP281, the Workgroup had reached a decision on the original solution, and 1 potential alternative, and hope to meet soon to vote on both solutions and review the final legal text/Workgroup Report.
- 8398 SA stated from a CMP280 perspective, throughout the workgroup process, solutions fitting Central Volume Allocation (CVA) and Supplier Volume Allocation (SVA) have come to the fore. In discussions at the

Workgroup, the nuances and intricacies of a solution which dealt with CVA storage only, or both CVA and SVA storage have been discussed at length. The solution for the Original modification only covers CVA, but an alternative has been raised within the Workgroup which looks at an overarching CVA and SVA solution. Discussions in the Workgroup have indicated that developing a solution to this alternative would require a lot more industry time spent on the modification (an additional 6 months) and would also require additional Workgroup membership from suppliers, aggregators and SVA specialists. The majority of the Workgroup feel that whilst this would satisfy the broader need for an all-encompassing solution regardless of allocation, it would be better to raise a separate SVA modification with a fresh Workgroup who would be better qualified to work up a SVA solution. In terms of the scope of the modification defect, a CVA only solution would not fully satisfy the defect for both storage and generation. If a CVA only solution was to be implemented into the CUSC, a separate modification would potentially need to be raised to prevent distortions in the market. Under section 8.20.8 of the CUSC before the Workgroup embark on a significant amount of work they would like to ask the Panel to provide some direction on the best way to proceed with this modification and the best use of industry time. The Workgroup would like to ask the Panel to consider whether the alternative should be taken forward by this Workgroup, or progressed as a separate new modification with a solely CVA solution coming out of the current Workgroup process.

- 8399 SA stated that Ofgem have indicated that they would like CMP280 to be progressed as quickly as possible, but the Ofgem representative within the Workgroup has also highlighted that they would prefer quality over speed. If CMP280 were to go forward with a CVA only solution they would like the reasoning behind this to be clearly documented within the Workgroup Report and for the alternative to be raised as a separate modification as soon as possible (ideally before the Final Modification Report for CMP280 is sent off to the Authority).
- 8400 SA stated that if a separate modification is raised, the Panel could choose to prioritise it over other modifications and put it near the top of the stack to meet Ofgem's concerns for a quick solution.
- 8401 LS stated that for transparency could Code Admin confirm members of the Workgroup who are also on the Panel.
- 8402 SA confirmed that SL, JA, RL and PM were all members of the Workgroup CMP280/281.
- 8403 GG stated that the essence of the issue is whether the description of the defect allows for the extension of the solution to include SVA.
- 8404 RL stated that there have been other modifications which have had narrowly defined defects but the Proposer/Workgroups have decided for the solutions to become a lot broader.
- 8405 RL stated that he did not feel SVA was within the original intent of the Proposal but it was down to the Proposer to decide whether to include this within his solution or not.
- 8406 GG stated that the new additional Workgroup members may not welcome joining a Workgroup halfway through its deliberations, given that they would have missed all the discussions around CVA. They may prefer to have a separate fresh Workgroup which could be seen as the more practical solution. The Authority can then be sent both modifications for them to make a decision.
- 8407 LB stated that he has checked the defect and it does not make any distinction between CVA or SVA. Therefore, it does not clearly rule this in or out.
- 8408 SL stated that the Workgroup have worked very hard and recognise that a SVA solution is needed, but they feel a lot more work will still need to be done within the BSC environment in terms of metering and process which they do not have the expertise to do. SL stated that the Workgroup can put the words into the CUSC but that is meaningless if they do not understand how it is going to work practically on the ground in the
-

-
- 8409 BSC environment between meters, suppliers, agents and aggregators. SL explained that is the big piece of work that still needs to be done.
- 8410 NR stated that he has tried to narrow down the SVA solution so that it will only require a BSC change proposal rather than a BSC modification, which will make it simpler in terms of process.
- 8411 NR stated that in terms of the wider supplier issues there is a need to specify how the process will work within settlement systems and how the metering systems would be identified. But there are other supplier related matters which would arguably be outside the scope of the BSC and the CSUC for e.g. how they identify storage providers.
- 8412 NR stated that he is not saying there is not more work to be done because there clearly is. Ultimately it is a CUSC charging matter that has primacy at the CUSC level and the BSC changes are only supportive of that change.
- 8413 LS stated that in terms of in terms of timings and process, they will need at least 12 months from the end of a charging year for their systems to give effect to this within their tariff setting/billing. They are unlikely to make April 2020, so the implementation date will probably have to be April 2021. This will also provide industry with further time to carry out the additional work required for a SVA solution.
- 8414 NR stated that he has narrowed down the SVA solution so that it only addresses simple storage sites so it should pose less of a challenge. They will be able to use existing settlement metering systems and a solution has already been developed for final consumption levies which is expected to be ready early next year.
- 8415 SL stated that the issue is they need comfort that if a supplier says to someone they are storage, then they are actually storage. It is the end to end processes and cross code impacts that still need a lot of work.
- 8416 NR stated that the system proposal that they would put forward is the one they have recently consulted on final consumption levies. The BSC Panel have given Elexon the green light to develop this further and they already have an understanding of what this technical solution (interface) between Elexon and the supplier will look like, even though it needs to be developed further. The part that is missing is how suppliers manage their agents into that process and how they manage their relationship with their customers/storage providers. NR questioned if that was a BSC matter or a commercial relationship between the supplier and the customer.
- 8417 LS stated that there does appear to be some distinct cross code and cross party issues (this includes parties who would not normally engage in the code processes), so there may be some validity in doing something completely separate.
- 8418 LS explained that If the Workgroup chose to include just the wording into the modification, the Workgroup and Panel would have to be very clear that any support for that modification would only on the basis that the appropriate cross party/cross code work is actually undertaken. From a process point of view it may be better to just raise a new tightly defined separate modification in the new year. That would allow the cross code/cross party work to be given more of a focus and some proper thought.
- 8419 LB stated that looking at the charging objectives the key driver here is around improving competition and we should try and encourage the best modification that has a chance of doing that.
- 8420 GG stated that whatever comes forward, whether it is this mod or another mod as well it needs to look at a complete solution and not just the short-term issue of storage on its own. It will also need to look at mixed used sites and the implications associated with that.
-

-
- 8421 GG stated that he sits on the European Commission stakeholder committee and they have set up an expert group looking into mixed used sites, storage and settlement.
- 8422 LS noted that this is something that they are also continuously discussing internally in terms of co-location and it is not just an issue within the scope of this modification it's across the charging methodology.
- 8423 JA stated that there was scope for a solution for SVA sites to possibly come out of the TCR/SCR process.
- 8424 PJ stated that the defect refers to storage and generation, and asked whether the original and the alternative proposed solutions for both.
- 8425 JA stated that the original Proposal is likely to be a storage only solution with an alternative that looks at both at a CVA level.
- 8426 SA stated that Ofgem's letter directed for generation to be removed from the scope of the defect, but the CUSC clearly states that the defect cannot be amended. The Code Admin Team has sought legal advice on the issue and whether the Proposer/Workgroup can narrow the scope of the solution to only cover storage and leave the defect unchanged. National Grids legal team has advised against taking this route and this has been feedback to the Workgroup along with the reasoning behind this. The Code Admin Team have advised the Workgroup that the modification should be withdrawn and re-raised with a more narrowly defined defect. They can then reconvene with the same Workgroup members and ask the CUSC Panel for the work that they have already done under CMP280 to be used for the new modification. The Workgroup have decided to ignore this advice and proceed with the current modification and a storage only solution. The Code Admin Team have therefore asked Ofgem to confirm if this will cause any issues in the modification being assessed by them. The Ofgem representative on the Workgroup has stated that as long as the Workgroup explains why the solution no longer ties into the defect (within the Workgroup report) then this should not cause any issues.
- 8427 LB stated that by changing the solution to only meet part of the defect would still leave some discrimination.
- 8428 DC highlighted that there were some DCUSA modifications that have been withdrawn for the same reason and they are planning to re-raise these with a defect that only covers storage.
- 8429 PJ stated that normally they would always look to see how the solution met the defect.
- 8430 SA stated that there are currently two alternatives one that looks at both storage and generation and one that is looking at CVA and SVA solution for only storage.
- 8431 NR stated that Ofgem have already confirmed that this is not within the scope of the TCR/SCR.
- 8432 TM asked the Panel to make a recommendation on how the alternative should proceed.
- 8433 SA stated that the Ofgem representative on the Workgroup has stated that it is up to the Workgroup to decide how to proceed with the alternative as long as they eventually get a solution that looks at both CVA and SVA.
- 8434 GG stated that he would recommend not proceeding with the alternative and for a separate modification to be raised.
- 8435 TM asked the Panel is they had any alternative views.
-

-
- 8436 AP stated that it does not seem efficient to separate this out, given that there are aspects of the CVA solution that may need to be encompassed into the SVA solution.
- 8437 JA stated that he would support a separate modification being raised. He did not feel there was sufficient expertise within the current Workgroup to come up with a solution to the SVA issue and CMP280 had also already passed the Workgroup Consultation stage. If Ofgem then chose delay a determination on CMP280 until they get both modifications, then they can choose to do that.
- 8438 PJ stated that he would also support a separate modification because CVA is quite a distinct separate system to SVA. PJ noted Ofgem's minded to position on the TCR/SCR that storage should be treated the same as generation. PJ stated that in considering a SVA solution under a new modification you will need to make sure that you also consider how generation is treated at that same level and make sure they are both treated equally.
- 8439 LS stated that the defect does not stop a SVA solution from being raised but she would feel more comfortable if a separate modification was raised. This would give due consideration to cross code and cross party impacts and provide a better solution.
- 8440 SL stated that the Workgroup has done what it can and he agrees with the views provided by LS and PJ.
- 8441 TM stated that she is getting a sense that the Panel supports an alternative modification to be raised.
- 8442 LB confirmed that he would also support an alternative modification even though it may appear inefficient to do so. This is because a different level of expertise is required for a SVA solution but there does need to be a clear commitment that this new modification will be raised.
- 8443 DC questioned if another modification could be raised with the same defect.
- 8444 LS stated that you would have to make sure it was worded differently so that the panel agreed it was a sufficiently different modification.
- 8445 PM stated that he would have said carry on with the alternative within the existing Workgroup.
- 8446 LB stated that if a separate modification cannot be raised then he would want the Workgroup to continue with the alternative.
- 8447 GG stated that the issue is do they have the same substantial effect. GG did not feel that they did have the same substantial effect as one was more narrowly focused then the other.
- 8448 The Panel agreed that their preliminary view on a separate modification being raised was that it would not have substantially the same effect as CMP280.
- 8449 NR stated that would a new modification not have to tackle both CVA and SVA and therefore overlap with CMP280.
- 8450 RL stated that if you wish to tackle SVA you need to raise another modification for all the reasons the Panel have already discussed.
- 8451 PJ stated that CMP280 will partially address the issue and the new modification will tackle the SVA aspect of this.
-

- 8452 TM stated that the Panel are broadly in agreement that a new modification should be raised and it will not have the substantially the same effect as CMP280.
- 8453 LS stated that it may seem dissatisfactory but it is the most pragmatic approach to take.
- 8454 LS stated that the alternative has not yet been voted into a WACM by the Workgroup and it is only the Workgroup that can make that decision.
- 8455 The Panel agreed with this but stated that they are making a recommendation to the Workgroup not to start this substantial piece of work relating to a SVA solution.
- 8456 NR stated that it is presumably up to the Workgroup to make that decision on whether it becomes a WACM based on the applicable CUSC objectives. Presuming that the alternative is not voted into a WACM will be raising the new modification.
- 8457 PJ stated that a member of the Workgroup could raise the modification
- 8458 LS stated that someone who responded to the Workgroup consultation may be willing to raise the modification but she would encourage them to speak to the ESO first.
- 8459 GG stated that he would advise Code Admin not to hold the next Workgroup on CMP280 until the new modification is raised, that way the Workgroup do not need to vote on whether it should become a WACM and the issue will just go away.
- 8460 LS requested that the outcome of the discussion should be feedback to the Workgroup along with a request for them to contact the ESO if they wish to raise this modification.
- 8461 The Panel agreed to a two-month extension to CMP280/281 to February 2018.
- CMP285 'CUSC Governance Reform – Levelling the Playing Field'.** CMP285 seeks to reform CUSC governance to enhance the independence and diversity of Panel members and ensure wider engagement from CUSC signatories.
- 8462 RH presented slides to the Panel to explain the background and purpose of the modification. RH explained that the Panel had decided that the modification should proceed to a Workgroup and that the Workgroup had met on seven occasions before concluding their activities on the 19 November 2018. RH provided a brief overview of the responses to the Workgroup Consultation which included the number of alternatives and WACMs that were eventually raised. RH confirmed that the Workgroup had met their terms of reference and requested that the Panel agree for CMP285 to proceed to Code Admin Consultation.
- 8463 The Panel unanimously agreed that this should now proceed to Code Admin Consultation (CAC).
- 8464 GG requested that Code Admin reduce the legal text for section 11 so that it only includes the actual changes
- 8465 PJ stated that there are some formatting issues within the document, when it is opened up and you view the Workgroup Consultation Responses.
-

8466 TM stated that Code Admin will take this feedback away and review the document/legal text before issuing the Code Admin Consultation.

New Action: Code Admin to reduce legal text for CMP285 and check formatting of document before issuing the Code Admin Consultation.

8467 RH stated that the CAC will be issued over a longer period of time because of Christmas and New Year and will close on the 11 January 2019. It will then be brought back to the Panel in January for a final Panel Recommendation Vote.

CMP286 ‘Improving TNUoS Predictability through Increased Notice of the Target Revenue used in the TNUoS Tariff Setting Process’. The purpose of this modification proposal is to improve the predictability of TNUoS demand charges by bringing forward the date at which the target revenue used in TNUoS tariff setting is fixed to allow customer prices to more accurately reflect final TNUoS rates.

And

CMP287 ‘Improving TNUoS Predictability through Increased Notice of Inputs Used in the TNUoS Tariff Setting Process’. The purpose of this modification proposal is to improve the predictability of TNUoS

8468 RH stated that they are awaiting further clarification from the Proposer on this modification and if a further RFI needs to be carried out on CMP286. RH advised the Panel that the Workgroup Report is due back in January, they are not currently requesting on extension on this but this may be needed at the December Panel.

CMP288 ‘Explicit Charging Arrangements for Customer Delays’. The purpose of this modification is to introduce explicit charging arrangements to recover additional costs incurred by Transmission Owners and TNUoS liable parties as a result of transmission works undertaken early due to a User initiated delay to the Completion Date of the works, or to facilitate a backfeed.

AND

CMP289 ‘Consequential change to support the introduction of explicit charging arrangements for customer delays and backfeeds via CMP288’. The purpose of this modification is to introduce changes to non-charging sections of the CUSC to support the introduction of explicit charging arrangements to recover additional costs incurred by Transmission Owners and TNUoS liable parties as a result of transmission works undertaken early due to a User initiated delay to the Completion Date of the works, or to facilitate a backfeed. The changes to the charging element of the CUSC are covered under CMP288.

8469 RH stated that this is nearly ready to be issued out to Workgroup Consultation. They are just waiting for some feedback on the Workgroup Report before they confirm a date for a short WebEx and then issue the Workgroup Consultation. A revised timeline will be created once the consultation closes.

CMP 291 ‘The open, transparent, non-discriminatory and timely publication of the harmonised rules for grid connection (in accordance with the RfG, DCC and HVDC) and the harmonised rules on system operation set out within the Bilateral Agreements’. The purpose of this modification is to set out within the CUSC the obligations in the EU Connection Network Codes and System Operation Guideline as they relate to the harmonised rules for connection and system operation in GB.

8470 RH explained that CMP291 was originally coupled up with Grid Code GC0117, but because they are doing a full impact assessment on GC0117 this is actually holding up the progression of CMP291. RH requested

-
- 8471 that the Panel allow CMP291 to be de-coupled from GC0117 so it can be progressed as quickly as possible. RH stated that they would also like to request an extension to March 2019.
- 8472 RL questioned why they were originally coupled together and why this was no longer relevant.
- 8473 RH stated that it was thought that there were synergies between the two modifications but there would be no issues in doing them separately.
- 8474 GG stated that as Proposer of both modifications he did not understand why they were originally coupled together.
- 8475 The Panel agreed to the extension and the de-coupling of the modifications.

CMP 292 'Introducing a Section 8 cut-off date for changes to the Charging Methodologies'. The purpose of this modification is to ensure that the charging methodologies (all Charging Methodologies as defined in the CUSC) are fixed in advance of the relevant Charging Year to allow The Company – as Electricity System Operator - to appropriately set and forecast charges. Introducing a cut-off date for changes to the methodologies will help to reduce the risk of charges out-turning differently to the forecasts produced by the Company and created by users.

- 8476 RH stated that there were no Workgroup meetings held in November, but a doodle poll has been sent out to host the next Workgroup meeting in December. RH requested an extension until April 2019 to allow them time to progress the modification.
- 8477 The Panel agreed the extension.

CMP295 - Contractual Arrangements for Virtual Lead Parties (Project TERRE). Under BSC P344 and GC0097, and future market arrangements, an aggregator will combine the export capabilities of SVA-registered embedded generation to participate in the BM. In order to facilitate Grid Code compliance, and to ensure appropriate rights/obligations for Virtual Lead Parties (as to be defined in BSC P344), accession to the CUSC is necessary and entry into specific CUSC contracts is required.

- 8478 JH stated that the first Workgroup meeting was held on 17 October and the next Workgroup meeting is planned for early December after which they may be close to issuing the Workgroup consultation. The Workgroup report is due back to Panel in December but because of where CMP295 has previously sat on the prioritisation stack Code Admin have not been able to facilitate as many Workgroups to progress this modification as it would have liked. Therefore, Code Admin would like to request a two-month extension until February to allow them time to do this. The Workgroup have confirmed that the modification needs to be implemented by September 2019 to allow industry enough time to assimilate itself with the required changes before Project TERRE goes live in December 2019.
- 8479 RH stated that that this was on track and the Workgroup Report is due back in February 2019.

CMP298: Updating the Statement of Works process to facilitate aggregated assessment of relevant and collectively relevant embedded generation. This modification is needed due to increasing levels of embedded generation connections the process for assessing their overall impact on the transmission system needs to be revised allowing the System Operator to recognise the changes caused by multiple small scale connections and plan accordingly.

- 8480 RH stated that the next Workgroup is planned for 11 December and they were currently on track to bring the Workgroup Report back to the Panel in January 2019.
-

CMP300: Cost Reflective Response Energy Payment (REP) for Generators with low or negative marginal costs. This proposal seeks to ensure that the Response Energy Payment paid to or by generators with respect to a BM Unit with low or negative marginal costs is reflective of the cost or avoided cost of energy production.

8481 RH stated that they had finally obtained quoracy for CMP300 and that the first Workgroup will be arranged for January 2019. A timeline will be agreed in the New Year after the first meeting has taken place.

CMP301: Clarification on the treatment of project costs associated with HVDC and subsea circuits. CMP213 introduced specific expansion factors for HVDC and subsea circuits however the existing legal text is open to interpretation – this proposal would cement the interpretation made by The Company to ensure consistency with onshore circuits.

8482 RH stated that they have received the send back from Ofgem. The Proposer has everything that they need to complete the Report and is currently in the process of adding these additional requirements into the Report. They are planning to bring this back to the Panel in December for a decision on whether this should go back out to Code Admin Consultation or if it should be sent straight back to Ofgem for a decision.

8483 RH stated that Code Admin would recommend that that this goes straight back to the Authority for a decision, as there will be no changes to the legal text.

8484 PM questioned whether the Panel can make that decision today and if they really needed to wait until the December Panel.

8485 TM asked the Panel if they are happy to make this decision without seeing the revised report.

8486 GG stated that he felt it should go back out to Code Admin Consultation because the Authority had clearly stated within their letter that they did not have enough information within the Final Modification report (FMR) to make a decision, even if this is just a short consultation.

8487 LS stated that they have learnt lessons from this, from a process point of view. All the information was available within the public domain and presented at TCMF but that breadth of information had not been added to the FMR. From a governance point of view it might be right that they issue a five-working day consultation just to tick all the boxes.

8488 RL stated all the information may have been presented at TCMF but they are not the decision maker.

8489 LS agreed with the comments made by RL

8490 TM stated she feels she is hearing support for another Code Admin Consultation.

8491 GG suggested that given that the Authority want this back as soon as possible, maybe they could circulate this to the Panel for a few working days to review before issuing a five-working day Code Admin Consultation.

8492 RH stated that this was due to be circulated to the Panel next Thursday with the rest of the Panel papers.

8493 LS stated that they could circulate this to the Panel on the 6 December and give them until close of play Monday 10 December to feedback any issues. It can then be issued out to Code Admin Consultation on the 11 December to the 17 December.

8494 GG stated is there any reason why they can't have a short 30 minute WebEx to get this sent off to the Authority before Christmas.

New Action: Code Admin to explore whether a short special CUSC Panel can be held in December via WebEx to carry out a Panel Recommendation Vote on CMP301. This would allow it to be sent back to the Authority for a decision before Christmas.

CMP303: 'Improving local circuit charge cost-reflectivity'. This modification seeks to make part of the TNUoS charge more cost-reflective through removal of additional costs from local circuit expansion factors that are incurred beyond the connected, or to-be-connected, generation developers' need.

8495 RH advised the Panel that timelines are still to be confirmed for this modification, but it is currently on track to return to the Panel in February 2019.

CMP304 looks to improve the Enhanced Reactive Power Service, making it "fit for purpose". This modification will enable reforms to commercial reactive power services that will create more useful and economic solutions, and new opportunities for providers. This proposal aims to ensure that the reactive power services (i) delivers transparency and clear information to the market; (ii) facilitates greater competition in the provision of services; and (iii) meets the changing needs of balancing services providers and operational requirements of the system operator.

8496 RH advised the Panel that timelines are still to be confirmed for this modification, but it is currently on track to return to the Panel in February 2019.

CMP305: Removal of the Enhanced Reactive Power Service (ERPS). The aim of this modification is to remove references to the Enhanced Reactive Power Service (ERPS) from the CUSC. This is an opt-in tendered commercial service for which no tenders have been submitted in seven and a half years, and no contracts have been agreed in nine years. There is an ongoing obligation for NG ESO to issue a request for tenders every six months. Given the administrative burden of running a tender exercise with no participants, the period for which no tenders have been received, and customer feedback, it is proposed that this obligation should be removed from the CUSC.

8497 RH advised the Panel that CMP305 was raised by National Grid and was submitted to the CUSC Modifications Panel for their consideration on 31 August 2018. RH provided the Panel with a background and summary of what CMP305 aims to deliver. RH stated that the Panel decided to send the Proposal straight to Code Administration Consultation.

8498 RH advised the Panel that five responses were received to the Code Admin Consultation and four respondents agreed that the modification better facilitated the applicable CUSC objectives.

8499 The Panel held a recommendation vote on CMP305 against the applicable CUSC Objectives. RH asked Panel members who had already submitted completed voting templates to confirm that their vote was still the same. RH then asked the remaining Panel members to confirm their votes along with the rationale for their decision. The majority of the Panel¹ agreed that the Proposal better facilitated the CUSC Objectives and that it should be implemented. The Panel agreed to supply the remaining voting statements to the Code Admin team. RH stated that Code Admin will circulate the Final Modification Report (including their votes) to the Panel for five working days to review and confirm their votes have been recorded correctly. Code Admin will then issue the Final Modification Report to the Authority.

¹ Eight Panel members agreed that the Original Proposal better facilitated the applicable CUSC objectives. One Panel member felt that the baseline better facilitated the applicable CUSC objectives.

-
- 8500 The Panel's Final Recommendation Votes can be viewed within the Final Modification Report for CMP305 using the following link:
- <https://www.nationalgrideso.com/codes/connection-and-use-system-code-cusc/modifications/removal-enhanced-reactive-power-service>
- CMP306: 'Align annual connection charge rate of return at CUSC 14.3.21 to price control cost of capital'**. The purpose of this modification is to align the rate of return applied to the net asset value of connection points in the calculation of annual connection charges (as set out at paragraph 14.3.21 of the Connection Charging Methodology) to the pre-tax cost of capital in the price control of the Relevant Transmission Licensee (plus a margin of 1.5 percentage points in the case of MEA-linked assets). This will improve the cost reflectivity of the charges, since the return on capital will equal the Authority's most recent assessment of that cost for the Relevant Transmission Licensee.
- 8501 RH stated that the Workgroup is now quorate. The first kick off meeting will be held on the 7 December and the next Workgroup will be scheduled for January 2019. Timelines will be confirmed after the first Workgroup meeting.
- CMP308: 'Removal of BSUoS charges from Generation'**. This modification seeks to modify the CUSC to better align GB market arrangements with those prevalent within other EU member states. This will deliver more effective competition and trade across the EU and so deliver benefits to all end consumers. It is proposed that liability to pay Balancing Services Use of System (BSUoS) charges, which are currently charged to all liable CUSC parties on a non-locational MWh basis, is removed from GB Generators. This will effectively better align the GB 'generation cost stack' with those in other EU markets where generators do not pay the equivalent of BSUoS charges, thus better facilitating competition between GB generators and generation in those markets which are not subject to such charges. There should be no adverse effects for GB end consumers, subject to implementation taking account of existing contractual commitments. Aligning the GB market arrangements with our European trading partners and other interconnected countries better facilitates an efficient functioning internal market in electricity. To that end, GB consumers will benefit from more competitive arrangements delivered through a wider fully functioning competitive market in generation. Whilst the EU Third Package arrangements recognise that different types of market organisation will exist within the wider internal market in electricity, they also acknowledge the need to reduce market distortions to deliver the full benefits of a competitive internal market in electricity. This is critical in the context of growth in GB interconnection capacity which is set to significantly increase (4GW today, 8GW by 2021 and, with Ofgem's approved pipeline, potentially up to 18GW by the early 2020s), which represents almost a third of peak GB demand.
- 8502 RH confirmed that the Workgroup was now quorate. The first kick off meeting will be held on the 4 December and the next Workgroup is planned for the 18 December. Timelines will be confirmed after the first Workgroup meeting has taken place.
- 8503 RH highlighted that they have also recently received a letter from Ofgem in relation to CMP308 which has been circulated to the Panel. RH stated it may be worth having a bit of a discussion on how the Panel wishes to proceed with this modification in light of this letter and Ofgem's recommendations. RH summed up the contents of the letter and stated that Ofgem have confirmed that CMP308 does not fall within the scope of TCR/SCR, but they would recommend that the modification is put on hold until the conclusions of the forthcoming Balancing Services Charges Task Force are published. Ofgem feel this would be a better use of industry resource, time and effort.
- 8504 RH explained that she has contacted the Proposer of the modification and he has circulated a letter to the Panel stating that he wishes to continue with the modification.
- 8505 TM stated that she read the letter from Ofgem and thought it was quite a strong steer but it was not in the Panels remit to tell the Proposer to withdraw the modification or put it on hold.
-

- 8506 LB stated but they can review where it should sit amongst the prioritisation stack.
- 8507 PJ stated he was uncomfortable with Ofgem's letter. PJ explained that a number of changes can be made to BSUoS in a modular way and can therefore be carried out as incremental modifications. The change that CMP308 is proposing, is not a new issue, it is something that has already previously been considered once and taken to Ofgem with a lot of analysis already undertaken. Given the nature of the defect it seems important that this modification is progressed in a timely manner. PJ did not feel that this would necessarily be the case if it were considered within the taskforce.
- 8508 RL agreed with PJ comments and stated that the Workgroup could inform the taskforce of the work it is doing.
- 8509 LB stated that he was surprised by the lack of a link to the TCR/SCR and felt there was a strong interrelationship between the two. LB stated he could see why Ofgem have asked for the modification to be put on hold.
- 8510 PC highlighted that the modification does go against the TCR. The TCR is saying levy secured sites and embed generation but this modification is saying put it all on demand.
- 8511 PJ stated that he didn't think CMP308 contradicted the TCR which was looking to introduce the same treatment for embedded generation as there is for transmission generation in respect of the charging for BSUoS. This modification would do the same if it concluded that generation as a class should not be levied BSUoS at all.
- 8512 SL stated that it would be useful to progress them both together along the same timelines so that the taskforce can be ran in parallel to this. That way one should not move forward without the other and they would be intrinsically linked.
- 8513 GG noted two points, the Proposer has indicated a substantial consumer benefit to this modification, which may or may not be the case when further analysis is carried out. The timeline for implementation gives stakeholders two years to prepare for this to be implemented. GG explained that he does not feel there will be substantially more work involved if this modification was to be run in parallel with the taskforce. GG stated that he felt a lot of the work will be complimentary to each other and therefore it should not have a signification impact on industry time and resource.
- 8514 LB stated that he feels it is about the order of the work that needs to be done. Doing work in parallel puts pressure on companies to be able to do both things together. LB stated that his opinion is that they should let the task force get on with its work. The Proposer should then see what they can pull out of the taskforce into their own modification and leave the rest for the taskforce to pick up. LB stressed that this taskforce will take up a significant amount of time and resource and with other modifications being raised and consultations taking place will industry really have the time to do both.
- 8515 PJ stated that there is the potential for a significant cross border distortion, because BSUoS is a variable cost that directly impacts energy pricing.
- 8516 GG stated that if there was a cross border distortion then the member state would be obliged to act to address this under article 8 paragraph 7 of the Third Package Directive.
- 8517 LS stated that LB has made some valid points and the ESO will struggle to give full quality support to both the taskforce and the modification with all the other TCR/SCR work that is currently going on. LS stated that they have fed this back to Ofgem and if the ESO cannot do both things she did not know how they can expect the rest of industry to be able to do this.
-

- 8518 PJ noted that if the issues in CMP308 were to be covered within the taskforce then the same work would still need to be undertaken. The deadline for nominations for the taskforce was not until January and the first meeting would be sometime after that. In the meantime, the CMP308 workgroup would be able to proceed with analysing the issue and noted that two workgroup dates had already been set for December. If subsequently it was deemed that the issue should be considered within the taskforce, then it would still be possible to use the work already carried out.
- 8519 LS stated that she was in agreement with Ofgem that there is a need for something to be done quite swiftly on BSUoS, in terms of understanding unequivocally if it can be evidenced that there is an appropriate cost recovery mechanism along with a cost recovery charge, rather than a cost reflective charge. The current arrangements are causing distortions and PJ has already highlighted cross- border issues.
- 8520 LS stated that she appreciated the Proposer's view that there is a substantial defect that needs to be addressed, but she feels that even if this modification was progressed and sent to the Authority they would not make a decision on this until the taskforce was complete.
- 8521 PM stated that he went to the ESO Webinar on degutting BSUoS (moving from cost reflectivity to cost recovery) and he did not feel that there was much support from industry to move in that direction. However, all the Menti comments within the Webinar have effectively become CMP308. In a world with issues around quoracy, CMP308 has achieved a large level of support and enthusiasm.
- 8522 LS disagreed with PM's comments. LS stated that the conclusions from the Webinar were that moving the charge to a demand only recovery made more sense no explicit reference to CMP308 was made in the Webinar.
- 8523 PM stated that they described CMP308 and stated that it should be charged on demand and not generation.
- 8524 LB stated that he attended several workshops and he has a different view. LB stated that in his opinion there were some initial thoughts around what were the most important things such as predictability and certainty, but as the discussions moved on those items fell down the list in terms of importance.
- 8525 PM stated he took a screenshot of slide 37 which stated that people favoured socialisation of BSUoS, which is the recovery approach. PM opinion is that the Workgroups for CMP308 should continue to go ahead.
- 8526 JA stated that there are some cross-border trade issues that could be addressed in CMP308 or the taskforce. If CMP308 continues then it is one thing off the agenda for the taskforce so there does not seem to be any harm in allowing it to progress. JA stated that his other point was in relation to cross over of resources. There is a tight timescale for the taskforce to carry out this work, they will be set up in January 2019 and conclude in May 2019. If the Workgroup are quorate and there is a willingness from the members to commit to both then the Workgroup should be allowed to continue.
- 8527 RL stated that he agreed with JA. This is seen by many as a very important issue so any decisions on prioritisation need to be valid and should not just be based on resources.
- 8528 TM stated that the majority of the Panel feel that CMP308 should continue. Ultimately it is the Proposers decision and he has made it very clear that is also what he would like to do.
- 8529 NH stated that Ofgem have made their views clear in their letter. It is then down to the Proposer and Panel to decide how to proceed, but Ofgem will be focusing their efforts on the new BSUoS taskforce.
-

-
- 8530 TM asked the Panel to decide if they needed to re-evaluate the modification's ranking within the prioritisation stack.
- 8531 A number of points were discussed during the Panel discussion on Prioritisation, including whether the modification should move down the stack because of the clear steer provided by Ofgem. Most the Panel agreed that the modifications position should remain unchanged, and it should only be reduced in ranking if it were to be put on hold. Most of the Panel agreed that the Workgroups should be held in parallel with the taskforce (back to back). The Panel suggested that Code Admin liaise with the organisers of the taskforce to try and facilitate this. As the taskforce, will not be set up until January 2019 the Panel recommended that the Workgroups planned for December 2018 should proceed as planned and then align with the taskforce in January 2019. The Panel requested a report back to the Panel in January on the timelines involved and the scope of the workgroup/taskforce.
- 8532 TM summarised the Panel's recommendations and stated CMP308 position within the prioritisation stack will remain unchanged, the Workgroups already planned for December will continue and then align to the taskforce in January 2019.
- 8533 SL confirmed that CMP307 would be remaining on hold until the final outcome of the TCR/SCR review.

7. **Discussions on Prioritisation:**

- 8534 RH stated that from earlier discussions she gathers there will be no movement to CMP308 but she did want to highlight some concerns that have received from the Proposer of CMP303 before the Panel start any discussions on movements within the prioritisation stack.
- 8535 RH explained that the Proposer has highlighted that there was a speech given recently by the BEIS Secretary of State, Greg Clark, and this modification needs to be approved by May 2019. RH stated that they have currently got a doddle poll out to hold the next Workgroup but this is currently sixth from the bottom.
- 8536 LB stated that if the next Workgroup is already being planned is there any point in changing the ordering of the stack. LB explained that he did not think moving a modification up/down a few places would make much difference in how quickly it was progressed.
- 8537 RL stated that it would be different if Code Admin said we could only do x or y.
- 8538 GG stated if they can get meetings organised we should have sufficient time to get through by May.
- 8539 GG and LB stated that it was not a complex modification, but there may be a few alternatives raised.
- 8540 LB stated that the Panel have noted the concerns that have been raised.
- 8541 The Panel agreed that no further changes were required to the stack.

8. **Chair Update**

- 8542 TM highlighted that BEIS and Ofgem will be carrying out a review into Code Governance.

9. **Standing Groups**

- 8543 **a) Governance Standing Group**
-

8544 GG confirmed that GSG had not met since the last Panel.

b) Transmission Charging Methodologies Forum / CUSC Issues Standing Group

8545 LS stated that there was a presentation on:

- Strategic charging issues - which have been under discussion as part of their RIIO work.
- Number of presentations from the ESO Revenue Manager regarding within year processes, tariff setting and references to small generator discount (which has now gone into a Statutory consultation issued by Ofgem).
- Cost reflective charging of multiple technologies behind a single connection.

8546 PJ stated that in the context of Ofgem’s letter on charging, one of the things that they mentioned was that National Grid would introduce a modification to address conclusions made in the CMP261 decision and asked whether there will be any information at the next TCMF?

8547 LS confirmed that they would be raising a modification and that she is hoping there will be some information on this at the next TCMF.

10. **European Code Development**

8548 NH had no European Code Developments update.

8549 GG stated that JESG met on the 13 November and they had an update from National Grid on European Connection Codes. They also had a discussion on Brexit and the next JESG was originally planned for the 10 December but this has been moved to the following week, so that it is after the parliamentary vote with BEIS involvement so that they can discuss and carry out any no deal preparations if required.

11. **Update on Industry Codes/General Industry Updates Relevant to the CUSC**

8550 DC stated there may be a few modifications being raised in relation to Project TERRE, so please keep an eye out for these.

8551 GG stated that in relation to Project TERRE he’d raised P374 at the last BSC Panel, which is also to do with Project TERRE and the BSC sandbox derogations approach.

8552 AP stated that at the DCUSA Panel there were two modifications similar to CMP280 which were withdrawn but they are being brought back as storage only modifications.

8553 NR stated that Ofgem have issued a consultation on Small Generator Discount.

8554 NH stated that Ofgem will be observing a Christmas publishing moratorium between 21 December and 2 January and do not expect to publish any modification decisions during this period.

12. **A.O.B**

8555 RH stated that she attended the CACOP forum earlier in the week and wanted to know if the Panel would be interested in future bi-monthly updates.

8556 GG stated that the Panel have already previously requested this.

8557 RL confirmed that the Panel would be happy to receive these updates.

-
- 8558 RH stated that at the last CACOP meeting they went through the CACOP survey results and Ofgem stated that the results should be used as a comparison across the codes because they all have different funding and governance arrangements. RH stated that they also looked at a lot of cross code impacts and horizon scanning. They had a brief discussion on Brexit but they are not entirely sure what modifications will need to be raised at this point, but they will be working across the codes to make sure this happens. They had a discussion around Principle 14 and the sandbox derogations. RH shared their prioritisation principles with CACOP, they are the only Code Administrator that is currently using prioritisation but it's interesting that Ofgem are encouraging prioritisation within the Energy Retail Code. RH confirmed that Code Admin will be chairing future CACOP meetings in 2019, on behalf of Grid Code.
- 8559 RH stated that the ESO Improvement Plan was sent out on the 31 October and she wanted to highlight that it was out there as it included all their quick wins and tactical improvements. It is Phase one of the Customer Journey work so hopefully everyone will start to see some improvements going forwards.
- 8560 RH stated that the final thing that she wanted to raise was Horizon Scanning. Initially she viewed this as cross code impacts over a six-month window, but in the long term they wanted to start looking to see how they can develop this into a three/five-year view which will include future legislative changes. RH asked the Panel if they had any views/feedback on who they should liaise with, what areas, timeframes they should be looking at.
- 8561 RH stated that the Panel are welcome to feedback later.
- 8562 TM asked the Panel if they had immediate thoughts on the issue.
- 8563 No feedback was provided, so TM asked the Panel to take this away and provide feedback at a later date.
- 8564 LS stated that this will be her last CUSC Panel, and John Wisdom will be the new ESO representative from December. LS explained that this was a result of a re-structure which has recently taken place within the ESO and she will be taking up a new role as Head of the ESO Regulation Team. LS confirmed that Colm Murphy will be heading up all of their code functions (technical and non-technical) from next month.
- 8565 The Panel offered their sincere thanks to LS for all her contribution on the Panel over the last 18 months and wished her well in her new role.
- 8566 GG thanked Code Admin for all the work that they are doing on their 2019 calendar on the ESO website. They would encourage them to reach out to their colleagues in Elexon, Ofgem and the ESO to include their meetings, Webinars on there.
- 8567 RL stated that there should be a calendar somewhere that has all this information on it.
- 8568 NR stated that this has been tried in the past, National Grid and Elexon were quite good at keeping this up to date but others did not do this.
- 8569 GG stated that even if we can get the Grid/CUSC/BSC meetings on there that would be really helpful.
- 8570 NH stated that Ofgem are conducting a joint review with BEIS on Industry Codes and Code Governance. A series of industry Workshops are expected to be held early in the new year with a consultation on proposals and findings expected in summer 2019.

13. **Next meeting**

- 8571 The next Panel meeting will take place at National Grid House on 14 December 2018 at 10am.
-

-
- 8572 Several Panel members stated that they would be dialling into this meeting as the agenda will probably be quite light touch with the run up to Christmas.
- 8573 RH confirmed that WebEx details would be circulated to the Panel.
-